Steph Crowell. Exploring Outreach in Community Archives. A Master's paper for the M.S. in L.S. degree. April 2020. 46 pages. Advisor: Helen R. Tibbo.

This paper explores how community archives conceptualize and actualize outreach. Using a survey instrument, the researcher contacted community archive workers to ask them how their experiences with outreach compared to the standard set by the Society of American Archivists. While each of the participating institutions did comply with the standard in their own way, further questions arose regarding the function of outreach and the life cycle of an archive. As an exploratory study, this paper is not meant to be generalizable but rather to test a method of collection information from community archivists about the kinds of work that they do.

Headings:

Community archives.

Interviews with archivists

Outreach

EXPLORING OUTREACH IN COMMUNITY ARCHIVES

By

Steph L. Crowell

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

April 2020

Approved by:

_____

Helen R. Tibbo

Table of Contents:

Introduction 2
Literature Review 5
Role of the Archivist 5
A Brief Snapshot of Community Archives 8
Outreach in Archives, Generally 13
Outreach in Academic Archives 15
Conclusion 16
Methods 17
Overview 17
About the Interview 17
About the Transcription 19
About the Coding 20
Results 23
Discussion 27
Difficulties and limitations of the study 27
Outreach as marketing 28
Outreach as collections development 29
A developmental model of archives 30
Conclusion 32
References 34
Appendices 40
Appendix A- Interview Questions 40
Appendix B- Characteristics and Use of Interview Types with Mixed-Method Designs 42
Appendix C- Transcription Criteria 43

Introduction

The Society of American Archivists defines outreach as "The process of identifying and providing services to constituencies with needs relevant to the repository's mission, especially underserved groups, and tailoring services to meet those needs."[1] Implicit in this definition is that an archive will proactively do internal research to determine who among its community is underserved and then will subsequently institute programs to rectify the error. An example of this is, in the literature, academic archives providing instructional services to students.

This paper seeks to explore how community archives utilize outreach activities. For archives that already cater to the underserved, how do they interpret the given definition of outreach? Have they developed their own definition? Do they look to the existing literature in archival science for inspiration? What methodologies are appropriate to collect this information?

This complex issue necessitates examining the changing roles of archivists in the last few decades, which may have contributed to the rise of community archives as well as to the understanding of where community archives and archivists fit in the realm of archival theory. Additionally, I will explore archival literature focusing on outreach in general to see if community archives conform to the kinds of activities popularized by these established institutions.

---

[1] Society of American Archivists, Outreach.

The goal of this paper is not to call for transformations of general archival practice or to make any value judgments on outreach work that is described by participants. Rather, it is an opportunity to survey community archives staff and explore how volunteers and professionals in community archiving organizations are already performing outreach. Further, this paper asks whether these workers conform to or diverge from the SAA's definition of outreach.

Much of the procedural literature surrounding community archives deals in issues such as preservation planning, collection development, acquiring space, and staffing. In other words, it deals with the internal archival functions of these archives. Outside of those, there is very little on how community archives staff actually interact with their communities in a professional way. It is repeatedly emphasized that a community archive and its designated community are generally close to each other, but that closeness is often presented as highly ideological and as the core of the founding of the community archive.

Beyond its beginnings, though, how does that connection impact how community archive staff think about and implement outreach activities? Beyond considerations of that connection, some of these archives may not have the same opportunities to host exhibits, teach, or provide tours like a university or government archive would- how do they compensate? Is online presence considered as a substitute for these kinds of activities?

The size of a community archive can range from a small-group volunteer-based operation to something larger, such as the Lesbian Herstory archives. The communities central to these archives also exist on a spectrum, which can include ethnic or racial minority groups, minority gender groups, groups concerned with social justice or civil rights movements, religious groups, LGBTQIA+ groups, rural communities, and more. These

community archives may have all, some, or no digital collections and may or may not be affiliated with a larger institution for support.

Due to this diversity, it is beyond the scope of this paper to present a representative sample of community archives to address the question of outreach. Rather, this project is an exploratory one that samples many kinds of community archives to see if any preliminary patterns emerge among these community archives either ideologically or practically. Are there any procedures shared among the interviewees? Are there common definitions of outreach?

As an aside, given the necessity that some community archives partner with larger institutions, generally academic archives or special collections, the relationship between these two entities must also be addressed. While this is a secondary point the primary question of outreach activities, the relationship between a smaller archive and a larger archive may influence the smaller archive in the kinds of activities it decides to pursue. Because of this, a section outside of the general discussion of "what is archival outreach?" in the literature review will be dedicated specifically to academic archives.

Literature Review

Role of the Archivist

What role is the archivist meant to play? Is it the record collector, the guardian, the activist, the instructor, the record maker, the reference expert, is it a combination of all of the above? Is an archivist more than the sum of these parts? What ethical duty does the archivist have to reach outside of the stacks or the repository and towards the public?

With the advent of digital records, these are all questions archivists were forced to confront- and are still in the process of confronting. Because of their versatility and accessibility potential, production of digital records has revolutionized even the way we define an archive, further blurring the line separating the library from the archive.[2] New models became necessary to conceptualize the workflow of the archivist;[3] new systems needed to be created to deal with A/V materials as well as print; metadata standards needed to be implemented.[4]

In addition to dealing with these many practical changes in the field, archivists also faced, and face, an existential one: to what degree should an archivist be active in the collection and dissemination of records? Specifically, how should archivists be thinking about the construction of digital environments? Archivists tend to be the ones responsible

---

[2] Paulus, 940.
[3] Lavoie.
[4] Elings, Table 1 (A grid of standards).

for providing context in which the records sit; this context is presented to the user along with the record.[5] In the digital age, format and user interface are also factors that help form context and that help shape the user experience, unlike strictly analog collections in which the user could gain some context independently with just only the object to observe.

From a collections perspective, discussions about the role of the archivist as collector have been going on since at least the 1960s. In a pre-digital world, the discussion revolved around reconciling the fact that the archivist was necessarily more than a custodian of records; they were also necessarily active collectors.[6]

In a post-digital world, the conversation has shifted; it is taken for granted that archivists have some role in collecting. However, what is uncertain is which principles should guide that collection. There are many voices who say that it is an archivist's responsibility to democratize archives, to dismantle the power differential between the archivist and the user, to consider social issues and politics as part of the collecting process.[7] There is a growing awareness in certain circles that the types of things that may or may not be found in the archives has a material effect on the user community; therefore, the archives are responsible for collecting robustly, particular in areas that may fall under social justice or activism.

One case study in Australia showed a glaring gap in archival holding: people in the community were looking for information about the "Stolen Generations, Former Child Migrants, Forgotten Australians and Forced Adoptions communities" and were tragically unable to find what they needed.[8] The authors of this study frame it in the context of

---

[5] Kallberg, 103.
[6] Lamb, 4.
[7] Gauld, 228.
[8] Evans, Mckemmish, and Mccarthy, 338.

memory. If the archives are meant to house collective memory, why are these areas being ignored? Whose memories are we privileging? The suggestion in this study is for archives to engage in activism to promote autonomy and, therefore, have the freedom to collect in such a way as to be truly representative of collective memory, while simultaneously strengthening public trust in the institution.[9]

On the other hand, people in the archives community argue that to build trust archivists must adhere more strongly to objectivity. They posit that the fundamental principles of archival practice are, "confidentiality, dissociation, veracity, and "avoidance of the irreversible."[10] In this view, the best ethical choice for archives is to maintain a certain neutrality. Houston's paper in particular argues wholly against existing statements of core values and statements of ethics for archivists, claiming that it will always lag behind real archival practice as it is dependent on normative social values of the time.[11] In this view, the role of the archivist should be a timeless one.

Other disagreements with the idea of archivist as activist are more philosophical. There is a view that the rise of postmodernism is a direct contributor to the rise of activism in archives, specifically Derrida's "Archive Fever."[12] In it is a theme of deconstruction, which posits that with a close enough reading of any text one will always find contradictions in it and it is this idea that is posited to be a driving factor in the attempted destructuralization of archives.[13] Critics argue that deconstruction creates a kind of responsibility that is impossible to live up to and encourages archivists to step back; action may be necessary, but a deconstruction view will lead to an unsustainable model in the long run.

---

[9] Evans, Mckemmish, and Mccarthy, 356.
[10] Houston, 46.
[11] Houston, 48.
[12] Derrida, 83.
[13] Matthews, 215.

What is an archivist? What are their responsibilities? These are questions that might not ever have concrete answers. There are ethical guidelines to help guide practice, but what those principles represent in the real world is still being hotly debated. What is valuable in this discussion is to recognize that the discussions of archivist as educator, archivist as activist, archivist as collector, archivist as creator, and so on, all come to bear when talking about community archives.

There is a certain caution in institutional archives (as seen above) about some of these roles that archivists are increasingly fulfilling, but for some people these roles have fundamentally changed the profession and have given rise to what we call community archives. Both sides of the coin have diverged even on a theoretical level, and for the idea of archivist as activist, community archives are on the cutting edge of defining what that role actually is.

A Brief Snapshot of Community Archives

Having established where community archives exist in the theoretical space, the next step is to determine how they exist in physical space. The rise of community archives spaces began with a fundamental problem of trust: communities learned that they would not find their own histories in the traditional archive and therefore set about collecting records their own history despite those archives.[14] Further, at times when these communities have been part of institutional archives, members of communities saw representation only as objects, not as people; as Flinn states it, "objects (of concern, of action, of surveillance)".[15]

While the phenomenon of community archives has been growing, Flinn also cites a concern that while there is research about the topic, it is primarily centered around case

[14] Flinn, 71.
[15] Flinn, 73.

studies and not necessarily representative of the whole[16], something I have found to be true while constructing this literature review. Before diving into those, it is important to highlight a few studies that have studied groups of community archives in an attempt to be more representative.

A study by Caswell et al. researched how those involved with community archives represented themselves and the importance of their contributions to the archival landscape. Using qualitative, semi-structured interviews, the team corresponded with seventeen community archives, founders, volunteers, and staff at twelve archives in Southern California.[17] They reported two broad findings: first, that the individuals interviewed felt "symbolically annihilated" and rendered invisible by both mainstream media and other archives and, second, that their involvement in the community archives in which they worked greatly mitigated the perceived harm from under- or misrepresentation.[18]

Namely, these effects manifested in reported increases in psychological well-being among participants. This was explained in three parts. First, that the materials contained in these archives provided a framework for how members of the community could fit into the broader society; for example, one member reported that the existence of these records transformed their experience of their identity from one of "loneliness and despair to one of solidarity and hope."[19] Second, the participants reported an increased sense of well-being due to the perception that the existence of the collections in some way justified their own existence in the society.[20] Thirdly, the respondents reported that the community space

---

[16] Flinn, 75.
[17] Caswell et al, 10.
[18] Caswell et al, 12.
[19] Caswell et al, 17.
[20] Caswell et al, 18.

helped them to feel as if they belonged in a society and had a defined social group of which to be a part.[21]

Another study that explored community archives in a more holistic way was written by some of the same people as the previous study. It focused more on the impact of physical space of the community archive on users. It also made use of a semi-formal structure, but this time participants were put into focus groups, with sessions lasting from 60-120 minutes.[22] Like the participants discussed in the previous study, respondents communicated a sense that the space of the community archive was a symbol of representation and a place for belonging. These respondents took it a bit farther and claimed that the space functioned as a kind of home away from home.[23] Due to the comfort of participants in this space, many even described that they felt empowered enough to make the archive a focal point for potential political action, organization, and self-advocacy.[24]

In both of these cases, marginalized peoples felt disenfranchised by institutional archives and were drawn to the community archive as a place to be represented and as a place to trust. These two items, in archival terms, demonstrate a need among these groups to have their collective memory and history preserved in an accessible place, as well as to have archivists whom they can trust to maintain that history with dignity. It is interesting to note that though some of these community archives are attached to larger institutions, the link does not seem to affect the trust that community members have to the community archive. One participant acknowledged that the dissonance between perceived trust of the two

---

[21] Caswell et al, 19.
[22] Caswell, Migoni, Geraci, and Cifor, 78.
[23] Caswell, Migoni, Geraci, and Cifor, 82.
[24] Caswell, Migoni, Geraci, and Cifor, 86.

different archives contributed to community interest in developing a physical space for the community archive.[25]

A third holistic study took a step away from describing the impact of community archives and instead attempted to categorize the elements necessary for a community archive to be sustainable. It split these factors into three broad points which were the same for every archive: consideration of the evidence collected that records contain, custodianship of the records, and community connection.[26] The researcher developed a checklist of necessary items needed for the archive to be sustainable and distributed it to various community archives, concluding that in order to keep them sustainable, some effort had to be made to ensure that more professional archivists were involved in the management of records. The community connection that the studied community archives had ensured that there was adequate funding to maintain them, but the researcher saw a potential problem in maintaining the viability of records without proper preservation and maintenance plans for the items in the collections- something that these archives may not have had the resources or interest to obtain.

As stated previously, much of the research on community archives tends to be concentrated in case studies. Of these, there is a distinct split: research that explores the difficulties community archives have in navigating specific archival concerns such as preservation, copyright, and platforming, and other research that tells about the lessons traditional archives can learn from community archives.

---

[25] Caswell, Migoni, Geraci, and Cirfor, 87.
[26] Newman, 45.

Studies in the first category are not limited by community type or nationality, spanning the LGBT community[27], environmentalists in New Zealand[28], vernacular music in India[29], bicycle enthusiasts in Indiana[30], and more. The unifying factor in all of these case studies is that they all explore the distinct challenges that a community archive faces when first coming into existence. Many focus on navigating legal challenges, how to bring a community together for the explicit purpose of creating a community archive, maintenance of daily activities, and other logistical items.

The second category is similarly not limited by community type or nationality. The theme of this portion of research into community archives revolves around lessons to be learned from community archives. For this discussion, is pertinent to mention that a small group of researchers have produced most of the materials that comprise this branch of study. Caswell wrote that, by understanding the processes of record keeping that community archives employ, archivists generally could better tend to the needs of its users- in this case survivors of human rights abuses.[31] In the case of the Lavender Library, Wakimoto, Hansen, and Bruce argued that the processes in collection, description, and collaboration of community archives can and should be implemented in the traditional archive.[32] Another paper used the case of three community archives to argue that professional practice should evolve to include more community/user participation in its fundamental processes.[33]

Studies in this vein tend to advocate for archives to explicitly decry neutrality. They also advocate for barriers between the public and the recordkeeper to be broken down to

---

[27] Cocciolo.
[28] Pringle.
[29] Deo.
[30] Copeland.
[31] Caswell, 319.
[32] Wakimoto, Hansen, and Bruce, 456.
[33] Wakimoto, Bruce, and Partridge, 311.

improve quality of service and effectiveness. Caswell, Wakimoto, Bruce, et al. tend to value a service-based approach rather than a custodial approach. When thinking about outreach in activities, it is important to bear in mind that some community archivists may have different ethical, professional, practical, and ideological concerns than their colleagues in government or academic archives and that groups like Caswell, Wakimoto, Bruce, et al. have been producing literature that suggests a tension between community archivists and archivists at academic or government archives because of those differences.

Outreach in Archives, Generally

The first thing to understand about outreach in archives is that outreach is conceptually separate from advocacy. With the changing role of the archivist (above) and the changing technologies and requirements of archival activities, preservation is getting more expensive; hiring is getting more expensive; funding is decreasing: archivists have needed to learn how to speak for themselves in order to acquire what they need to continue.[34] Brett and Jones argue that the idea of outreach is very disconnected from the need for advocacy; where advocacy involves internal needs and is profession-centered, outreach involves educating external participants in archival activities (i.e. the patrons).[35]

When asked what advocacy efforts archivists want to implement but currently cannot, Brett and Jones' respondents gave a variety of replies; this indicated to the authors that this was an area of growth for archivists.[36] Nowhere in this study was it presented that advocacy and outreach could be merged or could achieve a common goal.

---

[34] Brett & Jones, 51.
[35] Brett & Jones, 65.
[36] Brett & Jones, 56.

Brett and Jones' conclusions emphasize a fundamental difference between more traditional archives like university or government archives and the community archive: a traditional archive provides services to a community whereas the community archive provides services for a community with the community's direct input. In the case of community archives, programming and outreach activities correspond directly with the health of the archive itself. The archive is a means of advocacy for the community, and outreach is a way to bring people together for that purpose.As counterpoint to this tension, however, some would suggest that part of a conversation of advocacy and outreach *does* mean the traditional archives are becoming more integrated into their designated communities. The community-centric approach suggested by Brett and Jones teaches the traditional archive to be more aware of its community's usual activities, behaviors, and interests in order to become more relevant to them and to think about planning outreach activities based on these factors to increase community participation in the archive.[37]

While the findings of Brett and Jones mitigate the negative conclusions found by research from Caswell and her colleagues, it doesn't wholly free archivists in the traditional archive from the tensions between professional organizations and community archives discussed by Caswell and her fellow researchers. The traditional view of outreach described by Brett and Jones is still fundamentally top-down; it emphasizes the archivist as the collector, as the keeper of knowledge. Though Brett and Jones showed that an attempt is being made to mitigate the effect of a power dynamic between the archivist and the patron, research like that discussed in the previous section shows there is still a perception that the archivist in a university or government archive still holds on to power over who is or is not represented in collections and how a community is represented in the record. The

---

[37] Rettig, 32.

underlying tension the authors above are bringing out of this discussion of power is that a professional archivist in an academic or government archive may hold ideals that run contrary to those of the community whose records they hold, and this tension may contribute to difficulties in performing successful outreach to underserved communities.

Outreach in Academic Archives

When searching for information about outreach activities in academic archives, the activity that comes to the forefront immediately is teaching. Teaching with archival materials brings in both faculty and student researchers, which can often be an untapped user base for the archive.

Especially in the field of history, working with primary sources is an essential skill to pass off to students. Institutional archives and special libraries offer a unique chance for instructors to be able to provide this instruction on-site, offering a hands-on approach that would otherwise be unavailable. Though one study that interviewed archivists involved in such a practice showed that those archivists were generally uncomfortable being labelled as instructors, nonetheless the faculty involved defined them as such.[38]

In a much larger study, the idea of archivist as instructor is explored more in depth, and the results show that archivists bring knowledge of the items and the skills they have in evaluating items for historical merit. More importantly, in tandem with a faculty member, they possess the ability to pass along their expertise to students.[39] The partnership between archivist and instructor seems to benefit all parties in almost all cases in Malkmus' study: the students are able to engage in hands-on learning which is shown to be more helpful in

[38] Krause, 401.
[39] Malkmus, 416.

retention, faculty members acquire more tools with which to teach, and archivists are able to bring more people into the archives to make use of underutilized collection materials.[40]

A number of case studies support this method as the most effective for academic archives, of this type, focusing on student engagement[41], policies to guide instructional outreach[42], and its application outside of college-age students.[43] On this last point, a case study from South Africa goes so far as to say instruction should extend to younger children in the community at large. While this presents a variety of new challenges given the delicacy of records, the author argues that integrating archival materials into the education of young children can contribute to children's development of proactive citizenship and broaden a society's horizons for development.[44]

Conclusion

This literature review has shown a complicated array of ideas about the relationship between academic and government archives with community archives. Both groups make valuable contributions to the field in creating and implementing outreach activities and both have the potential to learn a great deal from each other. Tensions exist between institutional archives and community archives, but the literature has shown that once those differences are acknowledged, it is possible to work together towards a more holistic view of what outreach ought to be.

---

[40] Malkmus, 417.
[41] Harris and Merwe, 130; Meyer, 226.
[42] Woodward.
[43] TB van, 129.
[44] TB van, 117.

Methods

Overview

Data was collected through semi-structured interviews with staff members of various community archives. The selection process for these archives was not restrictive and attempted to gain the perspective of a wide variety of community archives (some of which did not self-describe as community archives).

After obtaining some suggestions from colleagues and searching for community archives to contact through social media groups and member lists of coalitions like the Online Archive of California, the Atlanta Black Archives Alliance, and the Consortium of Church Libraries and Archives, the call was sent out via email asking representatives of community archives to participate. After consent was obtained, the author sent participants a copy of the interview questions (see Appendix A) and scheduled the face-to-face interview. The interviews were recorded via video and/or audio, transcripts were created, and the de-identified transcripts were coded and analyzed. To ensure the reliability of the coding, the author shared the de-identified data with peers along with the developed coding schema for feedback and revision as well as to maintain an audit trail throughout the coding process. To ensure validity of the analysis, a draft of the analysis of each interview was shared with the interviewee for feedback.

About the Interview

To ensure the project was successful in its goal to be as diverse as possible, great pains were taken to contact communities across a broad spectrum of identity. To ensure that

no artificial labels were imposed on the participants or their institutions, the interview included a question that asked the participants to self-describe the communities their archives served. The interview questionnaire also included questions for the participants to self-describe their archives' size and holdings.

Open-ended questions allowed participants to self-define and self-describe. With such a diverse group of people who used different language to describe their activities, different levels of education, formal training, and experiences, it would have been unwise to assume that all participants would be working with the same definitions of "outreach" or "community archive." Some did not even call their workplace a community archive. For example, one participant from a local historical society did not self-describe as a community archive even though they performed the duties of an archivist as described in the literature review. The openness of the interview questions allowed for differences in personal, social, or cultural factors to be expressed by the participant and to be factored into later analysis.

But, because of the existing documentation of the narrative of the community archive phenomenon, it was not enough to perform a completely unstructured interview. The semi-structured interview instrument was appropriate because the author knew on a conceptual level what information they wanted from participants but was also aware that responses to questions on the topic of outreach may have been unpredictable due to the personal context of the participants. As such, they created a list of questions that was given to all participants in order to focus the interview. All of these components, according to Janice Morse, led to a textbook definition of the semi-structured interview (see Appendix B).[45] Additionally, because of potential challenges in communication, the author decided to send interviewees the questions ahead of scheduling the interview, not only to give the

[45] Morse, 195. Table 12.1.

potential interviewees another chance to opt out, but to give them the opportunity to ask any clarifying questions that may have been necessary before the interview itself.

The transparency of the described process also helped to facilitate rapport between the interviewer and the interviewee. DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree suggested that an essential piece of building rapport with an interviewee was to prove to them that they had the liberty to answer freely and in their own words; questions or language that would lead them to use unfamiliar words or terms could stifle an interviewee's freedom to answer, leading to skewed results.[46] Additional strategies to build rapport included repeating questions with some embellishment if necessary if clarification was needed, repeating the words of the interviewee to prompt clarification, and being mindful to ask for clarification in a non-leading and value neutral way when the previous strategy was impossible.[47]

About the Transcription

For this research, it was insufficient simply to take notes during the interview while it progressed. Since interview responses were the only means of data collection, interviews had to be recorded and transcripts had to be made. Once transcripts were made of the recorded interviews, which were kept on the author's hard drive and not shared with peers, faculty, the academic advisor, or any other party, the recordings were destroyed.

At no point in the interview did the author ask for a participant's name; the name does not appear on the transcript. The participant's title at their institution was collected for the purpose of developing clusters during the coding process. Archives were labelled as Archive A, Archive B, etc. To facilitate communications with the interviewee after the initial interview during the feedback phase of the research, a separate document was created on the

[46] DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 316.
[47] DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 316-317.

author's personal computer that associated the pseudonym of each archive with the name of the institution that it represented and with the email address of the respondent. After the follow-up contact with the interviewees was complete the document was destroyed. When participant responses were discussed in this paper, they were referred to as "Participant [number]." This nomenclature was all that was given to peer reviewers of the coding schema or to the faculty member

As far as the transcript itself goes, the guidelines chosen by the author came from Mergenthaler & Stinson who described seven key principles to thorough transcription.[48] All seven of these guidelines are included as Appendix C, Part 1 of this paper. Because these principles were rooted in the field of psychotherapy, some small transformation was needed; this was provided by McLellan, MacQueen, and Neidig and is included in Appendix C, Part 2.[49] One notable feature of merging these guidelines was the decision to transcribe speech as closely as possible to how it was said in the moment, and not to cut any part of speech that occurred in the interview out of the transcript.

About the Coding

To ensure that the coding schema worked as intended to capture the language and intent of the interviewees, I used grounded theory. According to this theory, the coding categories should not necessarily be predetermined but instead emerge from the interviews themselves. These categories may quote "disciplinary and professional reading, or [be] borrowed from the technical literature, or are the words and phrases used by the informants themselves."[50] The broadness of this categorization strategy allowed for elements that were

[48] Mergenthaler & Stinson, 129-130.
[49] McLellan, MacQueen, & Neidig, 65.
[50] Basit, 144.

described in the literature to be named accordingly, but also the flexibility to create new categories that were more authentic to the interviewees' own viewpoints. Newly generated categories may be compared with concepts described in the literature, but to retain the integrity of responses through the analysis it was necessary to keep participants' self-description as intact as possible.

Literature detailing successful qualitative coding methods emphasized the need for iterative coding; one sweep wasn't nearly enough to ensure that created categories were consistent and applicable. Burnhard went as far as to say at least fourteen stages of coding were necessary.[51] Saldana described the process of coding as two, multi-faceted cycles mediated by one cycle that mixes the methods used in the first and second cycle.[52]

While the number of iterations suggested in the literature varied, the lesson that emerged was that multiple iterations were necessary and that the author needed to attempt to view the data from different viewpoints at each iteration. It was suggested that the researcher could pay particular attention to attributes, structure, description, concepts, magnitude, emotions, values, evaluation, or other individual aspect of analysis at each iteration.[53] It would have been chaotic to try to find everything in one iteration; this method of multiple iterations ensured a systematic exploration of interview transcripts that more authentically and consistently captured information across all interviews.

Given the complexity of the coding process, it was important for the author to create an audit trail that detailed the decisions made for each iteration of coding and information about why decisions were made. The audit trail also allowed her to keep track of the kinds of

[51] Burnhard, 462-464.
[52] Saldana, 68.
[53] Saldana, 68.

information collected through each interview to ensure the same kinds of information were being considered throughout.

Thorough documentation assisted the author in obtaining feedback from peers and from interviewees about the chosen coding schema before any conclusions were drawn from it. The audit functioned as a step-by-step insight for peers and interviewees to understand the decisions of the author in choosing certain code words for certain aspects of the interviews. In conversations, the reviewers were able to confidently comment on both the code words or phrases used and the decision-making process behind them. This also empowered the reviewers to provide detailed feedback and corrections to the author's analysis and eased the process of implementing feedback.

Results

All four of the participants I spoke to worked in independent, nonprofit organizations. Participants 2 and 4 primarily collected materials pertaining to their city or town, Participant 1 collected materials relating to a marginalized group of people, and Participant 3 collected materials pertaining to a student group concerned with public health. All organizations were volunteer run and participants 4 and 1 had professional archivists on staff. Participant 2 had print and manuscript collections with a goal to digitize materials, and the rest had a mix of digital and analog materials. All participants except for participant 3 had a physical space to host their archive. Of the four, Participant 3's archive was the youngest by far; the others have been around for decades where this archive has only been created in the last few years.

On the topic of affiliations to larger institutions, Participant 2 reported past affiliations with state archives and a local university archive but no consistent involvement. Participant 3 was, at the time of the interview, working closely with a university archive for the purposes of a grant funded project. Participant 4 reported no official relationships with larger archives, but reported a healthy working relationship with them, stating that when materials would come that were inappropriate for their archive, they would recommend the donor to go to one of the larger archives with a more fitting collecting area.

As far as outreach, all four described performing some of the traditional activities associated with outreach (exhibit-making, tours, etc.) yet none were familiar with SAA's

definition of the term. Additionally, all four used the term "outreach" to describe some of their activities. Participants whose collecting areas were tied to their geographic locations reported some community support to host events such as walking tours of their towns, excursions to historical homes, and more. The most well-funded, Participant 1, reported creating galleries and exhibit spaces for living artists as well as hosting exhibit spaces for collection materials.

Participants 1, 3, and 4 added an addendum to their concepts of outreach- for them, not only was outreach about programming, but it was also about making connections with people in the community. Participants 1 and 4 explicitly mentioned the need to reach out to the more marginalized members of their own communities to ensure more robust and representative collections, while Participant 3 was still in the process of initial collection building.

Thinking about who is underserved or to whom archives should cater their services, Participant 2 is the only one who reported that their activities were primarily structured around the "out-group" - namely, visitors to their town. They emphasized that much of their funding came from the local community in the form of donations and memberships, but also how important the tourist industry was in their location. Their mission was to educate as many people as possible about their locale's history while also highlighting materials that were important to the local community.

On the other end of the spectrum, the mission of Participant 1's archival outreach activities had primarily to do with the "in-group", or their community. Of course considerations were given to how to reach people outside of the community; they reported creating educational materials for the out-group, but they felt strongly that their community

was the community that had been underserved so the vast majority of programming catered to the community's eye.

Participant 4 was more even on the matter. They spoke at length about the historical values of the organization and its new goals as well as the fact that the organization was in a period of flux. Their organization, in addition to regular activities that cater to the in-group and collecting materials from marginalized people in that group, had begun to grapple with the potential for social media to create a new kind of audience in what had traditionally been the out-group. Participant 4 also reported that the organization was considering rebranding itself for the purposes of getting more visibility to the out-group.

Participant 3, being from a newer archive, reported that this is a conversation that had not been had among the leadership team yet. At the time of the interview, they were still in the process of digitizing materials, collecting materials, and building a website to host the materials. However, when I read them SAA's definition of outreach their first reaction was to say, "Oh, so you mean like marketing." Following that remark, we had a conversation which will be addressed in the Discussions section of this paper.

On frequency of outreach activities, all participants except for Participant 3 reported regularly scheduled exhibit changes (two or three times a year) and regularly scheduled tours. Participant 3 said that their organization put out a monthly newsletter to members, promoted the archive online, and held an annual meeting for members. Participant 4 reported doing all of the above as well as regular initiatives in the archive's reading room, and weekly or semi-weekly social media posts and articles. For those participants who included reaching out to community members for materials as part of their outreach programming, both replied that those activities tended to be more serendipitous than planned.

All of these organizations had a ruling body in place, whether it was a board or group of co-coordinators, which made decisions on what activities to pursue. Participant 2, whose primary outreach activity was exhibit making, reported a singular person in charge of creating exhibits but that approval was still necessary by the board. Of the four, Participants 3 and 4 explicitly reported reaching out to general membership of the organization for ideas.

As far as measurements of success, all participants said that their consistent measurement tool was a tally of number of visitors to an event, number of engagements with an online post, or subscribers to the regular newsletter. Participant 4's organization sometimes sent out surveys among the general body as a data collection method, but those survey responses were not recorded and the survey was not regularly repeated. Participant 2 mentioned that, along with raw visitor count, staff determines success of an exhibit or initiative through verbal feedback from visitors (which is not recorded) and the increase or decrease in memberships from month to month.

Discussion

Difficulties and limitations of the study

The foremost failing of this study is its low response rate. The initial goal for number of responders was ten but that goal failed to account difficulties for participants who were volunteers. Namely, it was a struggle for them to prioritize making the time for an hour-long interview and a follow-up discussion. Compounding the issue of time, there were a number of participants who had initially made the time but, with the outbreak of COVID-19, had to withdraw from the study.

Given the diverse nature of community archiving, this study was never meant to attempt to collect a representative sample of community archives staff, but rather to test a method to gather data on how professionals and volunteers in community archives define and perform outreach. In that respect, the study is somewhat successful but is still hampered by the low rate of response. As such, it is recommended that if this study is attempted again that the researcher allows for more time to build relationships with the organizations they contact about interviews.

Another difficulty that ran through this study was insecurity among participants. With the exception of Participant 1, throughout the interviews I heard variations of, "I'm not sure how *we* can help you, we don't have too much to say." Before interviews began, I made sure to have as many discussions as possible with my peers and from mentors who do community work about constructively dealing with difficult power dynamics, but it was still

surprising to see that my status as a graduate student in a prestigious institution was intimidating to some of my participants.

For the issue of insecurity, the advice I described in the methods section from DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree on conducting interviews was an instrumental navigational tool. I am grateful to those authors' advice and to all of the participants of this study for having the confidence to answer my questions candidly. Moving forward, if this study is to be repeated, I would urge the researcher to be particularly mindful of potential participant insecurity. If I could have done something differently in my methods section, it would have been to look farther into what work has been done in researching the social dynamics between institutional archives/archivists and community archives/archivists/volunteers.

Outreach as marketing

The idea of outreach as marketing was a primary finding from this study. In previous reading about outreach, conversations around the subject tended towards a definition that revolved around ideological considerations of access, accessibility, and methods of sharing stories and content with an audience. While this version of the definition was certainly true for the people I interviewed, I also couldn't help but notice how many of them talked about outreach in relation to financial status.

Participant 1 repeatedly noted that the frequency of events and the complete utilization of their physical space was limited because the organization was trying to save enough money to install an elevator on the premises. Participant 3, whose organization was still relatively early in its development, explicitly stated that SAA's definition of outreach sounded like marketing tactics and they thought such tactics sounded like a good idea. They even went so far as to ask me to follow up with them about where to find that definition and the SAA glossary which explained it. Participant 4 noted that many options for outreach

were unavailable to the archive due to a lack of funding for full- or part-time staff in the physical space.

Time and time again, discussion of outreach activities related the outcome of outreach activities to some sort of material gain. Going into this project, I was more concerned with the ideological facets of outreach decisions and strategies, but the participants suggested a more pragmatic approach may have been more appropriate.

Outreach as collections development

On an ideological level, all participants except Participant 2 grouped together outreach activities such as exhibits and tours with collections development activities. Participant 1 noted that one of the core functions of their archive was to give marginalized artists a space to exhibit their work, which could then be accessioned into the collections. Participant 4 said that one of their goals in performing outreach was to go out into the community and make connections that would allow them to add more marginalized members' stories to the collections. Participant 3 was still actively soliciting materials from members to improve the collection.

As I was combing through the interview data and thinking about the definition of outreach given by SAA with respect to its inclusion of specializing services to suit the needs of "especially underserved groups," it struck me that the divide between collections development and outreach as concepts are not as clear cut as they seem. For Participants 3, 4, and 1 certain outreach activities were done with the intent to build up collections and encourage participation from underserved members of the community.

A developmental model of archives

One of the difficulties in analyzing the interview data of this project was understanding the context of each participant I spoke to. I was prepared from the reading I did before the project began to contend with the different social identities of the people I would speak to, but I was not prepared for the impact of each archive's stage of development. As has been noted, one participant worked in a brand new community archive, while other participants were part of archives that have existed for decades.

I noticed a marked difference in the kinds of responses about outreach I was getting from the new archive compared to the more established archives, particularly regarding born digital materials, digitization efforts, and the importance of a physical space to the operation of the archives. The participant from the newer archive saw much less of a need for a physical space than the other participants, reported a larger volume of digital materials, and a clear plan for how to digitize the analog materials in their collections.

This made me wonder about what the timeline of development of participants' archives would look like. For example, Participants 1, 2, and 4 reported the significance of obtaining a physical space early on in the development of the community archive. After obtaining a space, they tailored some of their outreach activities to fit the space. Participant 2 particularly was proud of the physical space's proximity to a high traffic area because it provided them more opportunities to get engaged with local businesses and the tourist industry.

Participant 3 reported no immediate considerations of a physical space. To me, this represented a significant difference in the strategic development plans for new archives. Because Participant 3 was less concerned with a physical space, they defined their success

through the accessibility of their online assets and their collection strategy heavily emphasized the collection of born digital materials or digitized materials.

This made me wonder: what would a lifetime model of an archive look like now? What did it look like twenty years ago? By lifetime model, I mean a model that shows the steps an archive must take to get from its creation to a point that it is able to sustain itself. This model would look different depending on the size of the archive, its resources, its goals, and its strategic plan for development, but I do wonder if there could be any overlap or trends that emerge between archives with similar goals.

Conclusion

As the field of archives evolves and community archives become more commonplace, it is imperative to create accessible literature to document the core functions of archival work. It was the aim of this study to find a method to explore how people working in community archives think about one of those core functions: outreach.

At the end of the study, I found my initial research question opened the door to new research questions. Is outreach marketing? Is it ideological? Is it both? To what extent? How much overlap is there between outreach and collections development?

The results of this study indicate to me that asking others in the field what they're doing for outreach and why they're doing it can produce complicated results but also could inform literature that gives us ideas about what outreach activities could be effective in our own work context. It also shows that we do not all operate under the same definitions of essential archival tasks.

With further study and a larger participant pool, I wonder what trends may emerge in the data. As noted in the discussion, there were some stark contrasts between participants' goals and contexts that made it difficult to offer any generalizations. Perhaps with a larger participant pool it would be possible to find ways to categorize community archives in a meaningful way to describe trends in outreach activity, much like Krause and Malkmus described instruction as a staple outreach activity of university archive.

That being said, this study was not a comprehensive survey of the field of community archives and was limited to American organizations. Perhaps with a broader survey, many of the questions that emerged in this study could be answered.

If I were to do this study again, I would try to make it more accessible to volunteer organizations by creating a survey instrument as well as the interview instrument. While a survey decreases the richness of data that may be collected, it would be a more succinct data-gathering tool that would require less time for potential participants to complete. I would also ensure that there was more than a semester's worth of time to do the research portion of the project to be able to accommodate the schedules of potential participants.

References

Basit, Tehima. (2003). Manual or electronic? The role of coding in qualitative data analysis. Educational Research. 45(2): 143-154. Doi: 10.1080/0013188032000133548

Brett, Jeremy, & Jones, Jasmine. (2013). Persuasion, promotion, perception: Untangling archivists' understanding of advocacy and outreach. Provenance, Journal of the Society of Georgia Archivists, 31(1), 51-74.

Burnhard, Philip. (1991). A method of analyzing interview transcripts in qualitative research. Nurse Education Today, 11(6), 461-466. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/0260-6917(91)90009-Y

Caswell, M., et al. (2018). Imagining transformative spaces: The personal–political sites of community archives. Archival Science, 18(1), 73-93. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1007/s10502-018-9286-7

Caswell, M., Migoni, A. A., Geraci, N., & Cifor, M. (2017). 'To be able to imagine otherwise': Community archives and the importance of representation. Archives and Records, 38(1), 5-26. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/23257962.2016.12

Caswell, M. (2014). Toward a survivor-centered approach to records documenting human rights abuse: Lessons from community archives. Archival Science, 14(3-4), 307-322. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1007/s10502-014-9220-6

CCSDS Secretariat, Space Communications and Navigation Office. (2012) *Reference model for an open archival information system (OAIS).* Washington, D.C.: NASA Headquarters.

Cocciolo, A. (2017). Community archives in the digital era: A case from the LGBT community. Preservation, Digital Technology & Culture, 45(4), 157-165. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1515/pdtc-2016-0018

Copeland, A., Lipinski, T., & Jones, K. (2017). Collecting, organizing, and preserving diverse publication sources for the good of one community archive: Legal challenges and recommendations. Grey Journal (TGJ), 13(2), 110–122. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=lih&AN=123453247&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Deo, A. (2013). Digital community archives for vernacular musics: Cases from India. IASA Journal, (41), 15-20. Retrieved from http://libproxy.lib.unc.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/docview/1496970399?accountid=14244

Derrida, Jacques. (1996). *Arrchive fever: a Freudian impression.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DiCicco-Bloom, B. & Crabtree, B.F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. Medical Education, 40. Doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x

Elings, M., & Waibel, G. (2007). Metadata for all: Descriptive standards and metadata sharing across libraries, archives and museums. First Monday, 12(3). doi: https://doi-org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.5210/fm.v12i3.1628

Evans, J., Mckemmish, S., Daniels, E., & Mccarthy, G. (2015). Self-determination and archival autonomy: Advocating activism. Archival Science, 15(4), 337-368. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1007/s10502-015-9244-6

Flinn, A., Stevens, M., & Shepherd, E. (2009). Whose memories, whose archives? independent community archives, autonomy and the mainstream. Archival Science, 9(1-2), 71-86. Retrieved from http://libproxy.lib.unc.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/docview/57691851?accountid=14244

Gauld, Craig. (2017). Democratising or privileging: the democratization of knowledge and the role of the archivist. Archival Science, 17(3). doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-015-9262-4

Harris, K., & van, d. M. (2009). Accessible archives: Students as active users. ESARBICA Journal, 28. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.4314/esarjo.v28i1.44400

Houston, R. D. (2013). Archival ethics and the professionalization of archival enterprise. Journal of Information Ethics, 22(2), 46-60. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.3172/JIE.22.2.46

Kallberg, M. (2012). Archivists 2.0: Redefining the archivist's profession in the digital age. Records Management Journal, 22(2), 98-115. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1108/09565691211268162

Krause, Magia. (2010). "It Makes History Alive for them": The role of Archivists and Special Collections Librarians in Instructing Undergraduates. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 36(5). Retrieved from https://auth-lib-unc-edu.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/ezproxy_auth.php?url=http://search.ebscohost.com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=lls&AN=502998333&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Lamb, W. (1966). The Changing Role of the Archivist. The American Archivist, 29(1), 3-10. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40290557

Lavoie, B. The OAIS reference model. Retrieved from https://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2000/lavoie-oais.html.

Malkmus, D. (2010). "Old stuff" for new teaching methods: Outreach to history faculty teaching with primary sources. Portal: Libraries and the Academy, 10(4), 413-435. doi: http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1353/pla.2010.0008

Matthews, R. J. (2016). Is the archivist a "radical atheist" now? deconstruction, its new wave, and archival activism. Archival Science, 16(3), 213-260. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1007/s10502-015-9248-2

Mergenthaler, Erhard, & Stinson, Charles. (1992). Psychotherapy transcription standards. Psychotherapy Research, 2(2), 125-142. Doi: 10.1080/10503309212331332904

McLellan, E., MacQueen, K. M., & Neidig, J. L. (2003). Beyond the Qualitative Interview: Data Preparation and Transcription. Field Methods, 15(1), 63–84. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X02239573

Meyer, L. M. (2011). Historian as archivist: History, archives, and outreach at Colorado state university. Journal of Archival Organization, 9(3-4), 226-236. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/15332748.2011.640889

Morse, Janice M. The implications of interview type and structure in mixed-method designs. In *The SAGE Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft.* 2nd ed. (pp.193-205). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Newman, J. (2012). SUSTAINING COMMUNITY ARCHIVES. Australasian Public Libraries and Information Services, 25(1), 37-45. Retrieved from http://libproxy.lib.unc.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/docview/956671400?accountid=14244

Paulus,Michael J.,,Jr. (2011). Reconceptualizing academic libraries and archives in the digital age. Portal : Libraries and the Academy, 11(4), 939-952. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1353/pla.2011.0037

Pringle, M. (2016). Getting to know you... regular feature profiling New Zealand's archive community. Archifacts, , 69. Retrieved from http://libproxy.lib.unc.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/docview/1810900876?accountid=14244

Rettig, Patricia J. (2008). An integrative approach to archival outreach: a case study of becoming part of the constituents' community. Journal of Archival Organization, 5(3), 31-46. Doi: 10.1080/15332740802174175

Saldana, Johnny. (2016) *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers.* London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Society of American Archivists. Outreach. Retrieved from https://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/o/outreach

Stecklein, H. J., & Wheaton, M. N. (2011). Mutual advocacy: Developing shared outreach programs with institutional partners. Against the Grain, 23(6), 36. Retrieved from http://libproxy.lib.unc.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/docview/1364693342?accountid=14244

TB van, d. W. (2011). Re-thinking and re-positioning archives: Taking archives to the children. ESARBICA Journal, 30, 115-134. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.4314/esarjo.v30i1.

Wakimoto, Diana K., Bruce, Christine, & Partridge, Helen. (2013). Archivist as activist: lessons from three queer community archives in California. Archival Science, 13(4). Retrieved from https://link-springer-com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/article/10.1007%2Fs10502-013-9201-1

Wakimoto, D. K., Hansen, D. L., & Bruce, C. (2013). The case of LLACE: Challenges, triumphs, and lessons of a community archives. The American Archivist, 76(2), 438-457. Retrieved from http://libproxy.lib.unc.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/docview/1512200493?accountid=14244

Woodward, E. (2013). Heritage protocol at Florida State University. Journal of Archival Organization, 11(1-2), 83-112. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.lib.unc.edu/10.1080/15332748.2013.884402

Appendices

Appendix A- Interview Questions

Part One: About you and your archive

1) What is your title within the archive?
2) Which community/communities does your archive primarily serve?
3) What needs for your community/communities do you meet? Said another way, what services do you provide that your community/communities might not find in a traditional archive setting or elsewhere?
4) What does your collection primarily consist of: print, digital items, artifacts, or a roughly equal mixture of all of the above? How large is your collection?
5) Do you have a dedicated physical space for your archive?
6) Are you affiliated with a larger institution? If so, what do you gain from the partnership? What does the larger institution gain?
7) Do you have a consistent stream of income to help pay for staffing and services?
8) If applicable, to what degree does funding limit the services you can provide or the staff you are able to hire at your archive?
9) Approximately what is your ratio of full-time staff to volunteers? To part-time staff?

Part Two: On Outreach

The Society of American Archivists defines outreach as: "The process of identifying and providing services to constituencies with needs relevant to the repository's mission, especially underserved groups, and tailoring services to meet those needs… activities may include exhibits, workshops, publications, and educational programs."

1) Given only this definition of outreach, does your archive provide outreach services?
2) Does your archive use a different definition of outreach? If so, please explain.
3) The given definition emphasizes reaching out to underserved groups. Thinking about your community/communities and the people outside of it, who would you consider to be underserved groups for your archive?
4) If applicable, to which of these groups does your archive cater outreach activities?
5) If applicable, what kinds of outreach activities does your archive engage in? Keep in mind that the examples given with the definition are not a complete list of possible activities and that outreach does *not* necessarily have to be towards underserved groups.
6) How frequently do you perform these activities

7) Do you have a preferred method of measuring the success of these activities?
    a. If applicable, could you provide an example of an outreach activity you considered successful and one that was no?
    b. If you have a preferred metric to measure success, how did you obtain that data from your events?
8) Please describe the process of how your archive turns an idea for an outreach activity into action. Consider questions such as: Who is involved? Who makes the final decision? How is the activity staffed? Where would the activity take place?
9) Do you have anything you would like to add about how your archive handles outreach?

Appendix B- Characteristics and Use of Interview Types with Mixed-Method Designs

Table 12.1 Characteristics and Use of Interview Types With Mixed-Method Design

Characteristics	*Type of Interviews*				
	Unstructured (Narrative) Interviews	*Guided Interviews*	*Focus Group Interviews*	*Semistructured Interviews*	*Quantitative Questionnaires (Closed-Ended)*
Domain	Not known	Partially known	Partially known	Known	Known
Direction of inquiry	Inductive	Inductive	Usually inductive	Deductive or inductive	Deductive
Approach	Investigator learns about phenomena during the course of the inquiry Investigator assumes listening mode	Investigator guides the order and direction of the interview but not the specific content	Interviewer develops questions designed to stimulate conversation among participants, thereby eliciting the necessary data	Investigator knows the questions that need to be asked but not all the possible responses	Investigator knows that questions and responses are necessary
Questions	Not planned in advance but developed during the course of the inquiry	Broad questions (6–10) developed to guide the course (but not the content) of the interview	Questions and prompts planned in advance	Question stems (and sometimes prompts) planned in advance	Questions and response choices planned in advance
Responses	"Long responses" conducted with minimal interruption Interviews not equivalent	Interviewer guides participants' "long responses" Interviews only partly equivalent	Discussion among participants with facilitator prompts to elicit various perspectives Group interviews only partly equivalent	Unscripted (free) responses to set open-ended questions All respondents are asked the same questions	All respondents are asked the same questions in the same order Participant selects responses
Sample	Sample changes according to the informational needs of the emerging analysis	Sample characteristics identified	Sample characteristics identified	Sample characteristics identified	Sample randomly selected from the selected population
Sample size	Depends on the scope and complexity of the phenomena	Depends on the scope and complexity of the phenomena	Number of groups and number of participants and purpose of study must be considered	If data are to be numerically transposed, at least 30 participants are required.	Large: size determined by number of questions
Analysis	Concurrent with collection	Concurrent with collection	Concurrent or at end of data collection	Analysis at end of data collection	Analysis at end of data collection
Point of interface for QUAL	QUAL-*qual*, results narrative point of interface	QUAL-*qual*, results narrative point of interface	QUAL-*qual*, results narrative point of interface	QUAL-*qual*, results narrative point of interface	QUAL-*quan*, results narrative point of interface
Point of interface for QUAN	QUAN-*qual*, results narrative point of interface	QUAN-*qual*, results narrative point of interface	QUAN-*qual*, results narrative point of interface	QUAN-*quan*, results; if textual data are transformed, analytic point of interface	QUAN-*quan*, results

Morse, 195. Table 12.1.

Appendix C- Transcription Criteria

Part 1: Psychotherapy Guidelines

1. *Preserve morphologic naturalness of transcription.* The graphemic presentation of word forms, the form of commentaries, and the use of punctuation should be as similar as possible to theh presentation and use generally accepted in written text.
2. *Preserve naturalness of the transcript structure.* The printed format should be as similar as possible to what is generally accepted, like the printed versions of radio plays or movie scripts. The text must be clearly structured by speech markers.
3. *The transcript should be an exact reproduction.* The loss of information resulting from the transition from a visual and/or acoustic to a written record of the interview should be as small as possible. A transcript should not be prematurely reduced but should be kept as a raw data form.
4. *The transcription rules should be universal.* The rules governing transcription should, as much as possible, make the transcripts suitable for both human and machine use.
5. *The transcription rules should be complete.* It should be possible for the transcriber to prepare transcripts using only these rules based on his or her everyday language competence. Specific knowledge, such as codings stemming from various linguistic theories, should not be required.
6. *The transcription rules should be independent.* It should be possible to transcribe various kinds of therapeutic discourse with the same set of rules. Transcription standards should be independent of the transcriber, understandable and applicable by secretaries and scientists.
7. *The transcription rules should be intellectually elegant.* The transcription rules must be limited in number, simple, and easy to learn.
   Mergenthaler & Stinson, 129-130.

Part 2: Revised Guidelines

1. *Preserve the morphologic naturalness of transcription*. Keep word forms, the form of commentaries, and the use of punctuation as close as possible to speech presentation and consistent with what is typically acceptable in written text.
2. *Preserve the naturalness of the transcript structure*. Keep text clearly structured by speech markers (i.e., like printed versions of plays or movie scripts).
3. *The transcript should be an exact reproduction*. Generate a verbatim account. Do not prematurely reduce text.
4. *The transcription rules should be universal*. Make transcripts suitable for both human/researcher and computer use.
5. *The transcription rules should be complete*. Transcribers should require only these rules to prepare transcripts. Everyday language competence rather than specific knowledge (e.g., linguistic theories) should be required.
6. *The transcription rules should be independent*. Transcription standards should be independent of transcribers as well as understandable and applicable by researchers or third parties.

7. *The transcription rules should be intellectually elegant*. Keep rules limited in number, simple, and easy to learn.
   McLellan, MacQueen, & Neidig, 65.